

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE
SUPERIOR COURT, MERRIMACK, SS

Case No.: 217-2024-CR-01167

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,

vs.

ANNA BARBARA HANTZ MARCONI,

vs.

BROK-ALAN WOODWARD-GRIFFITH,
INTERVENOR

**MOTION TO RECONSIDER THE
COURT’S OCTOBER 10TH, 2025 ORDER
ON RENEWED AND SUPPLEMENTAL
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

NOW COMES Putative Intervenor Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith (“Griffith,”
“Intervenor”), **forced *pro se***, and hereby respectfully moves this Honorable Court to reconsider
the October 10th, 2025 Order on Intervenor’s *Renewed and Supplemental Motion to Intervene*
(Doc. 159). For the facts, reasons, and arguments following, Intervenor respectfully states that
the Honorable Court erred in declaring mootness, and therefore must reconsider the Order.

FACTUAL BACKGROUND

1. The *Renewed and Supplemental Motion to Intervene* (Doc. 159) (hereinafter, the “*Motion*”) represents a third, and ongoing attempt, to exercise Intervenor’s constitutional rights to seek and produce evidence under well-settled precedent, and under constitutional right, both state and federal.
2. The *Motion* itself was filed on October 7th, 2025 – one (1) hour prior to the Court ratifying Defendant Hantz-Marconi’s plea deal, and prior to the Court’s alleged “closure” of the case. Notably, Defendant Hantz-Marconi’s plea deal was only announced the day prior, on October 6th, 2025.

- 1 3. The resulting Order, issued by the Court, declared that putative Intervenor’s *Motion* was
2 “MOOT as the case is now closed.” This order was issued on October 10th, 2025. See
3 attached **Exhibit 1** – Clerk’s Notice of Decision sent October 10th, 2025. Further, the Court,
4 for a third time, did not follow the proper procedure: it did not notice the parties, it did not
5 take pleading, it did not permit meaningful adversarial testing, and summarily denied the
6 *Motion*.
7
8 4. This instant timely reconsideration followed.

9 **ARGUMENT**

10 **I. The Trial Court Failed to Properly Apply Mootness**

11 A matter is only moot “when it no longer presents a justiciable controversy because issues
12 involved have become academic or dead.” Londonderry School Dist. SAU #12 v. State, 157 NH
13 734, 736 (2008). Furthermore, mootness is a matter of “convenience and discretion,” and where
14 a party “raises issues of significant constitutional dimensions,” the correct conclusion is to issue
15 a decision on the merits, as there exists “pressing public interest in those issues” that must be
16 adjudicated to avoid “future litigation of those same issues.” Royer v. State Dep’t. of Emp. Sec.,
17 118 NH 673, 675 (1978).

18 Here, the matter at hand is neither “academic nor dead,” as Intervenor’s constitutional rights
19 to seek evidence are at stake. Moreover, the public’s rights and interests, under the New
20 Hampshire Constitution, Part I, Art. 8, are similarly at stake. As highlighted in the memorandum
21 of law attached to Intervenor’s *Motion*, these issues were discussed and highlighted to the Court.
22 Royer, *supra*, was ***specifically*** addressed and cited to this Court as well. While it may be true that
23 the case is “closed,” this point is not conceded by the Intervenor. *Arguendo*, even if the case were
24
25
26
27
28

1 closed, this does not render Intervenor’s constitutional rights “academic or dead,” as to accessing
2 these grand jury materials.

3 Accordingly, Intervenor would respectfully state that declaring mootness, when Intervenor’s
4 and the Public’s constitutional rights were at stake, was an abuse of discretion by the Court, and
5 an erroneous conclusion, which merits reconsideration. A hearing should have been held, and
6 Intervenor respectfully requests that the Honorable Court overturn the Order, and schedule a
7 hearing for proper argument on the issues presented.
8

9 **II. To The Extent The Order Relies on Closure Of the Case to Apply Mootness,**
10 **This Too Is an Error**
11

12 As recognized in case after case, there are many circumstances where pleadings continue past
13 the final order or verdict issued. This instant case at bar is no exception, and this particular
14 motion by Intervenor is one such circumstance. Moreover, it is amply recognized in New
15 Hampshire law that intervention **must be granted**, where to deny intervention would result in
16 extinguishment of the suitor’s rights. To the extent the Court relied on the purported closure of
17 the case when the Court rendered a verdict, this creates an abuse of discretion, but also a law-fact
18 error which necessitates *de novo* review, and the Court must overturn the Order.
19

20 A person intervening must have a right involved in a trial, “such as would suffer if not indeed
21 be sacrificed were the court to deny the privilege.” Snyder v. N.H. Savings Bank, 134 NH 32, 35
22 (1991). Moreover, in accessing court records, “no one can accurately determine in advance when
23 access to court records may be sought or for what purpose.” Petition of Keene Sentinel, 136 N.H.
24 121, 129 (N.H.,1992) Here, it was amply demonstrated that both Intervenor’s constitutional
25 rights, and the public’s constitutional rights, were at stake when Intervenor sought to access these
26 court materials. See Doc. 159, generally.
27
28

1 Simply because this Honorable Court rendered a verdict, this does not “close” the case, nor
2 does it prevent further pleadings being filed or adjudicated, nor does it support “mootness.” In
3 fact, the Honorable Court’s determination that it had rendered a verdict, and therefore the matter
4 was “closed” and “moot” is illogical, and plainly against the well-settled law. As noted in Keene
5 Sentinel, 136 NH at 129, the motion to intervene in that case “**was thirteen or nine years after**
6 **[the] final decision had been reached.**” Even if the Court were to decide that a verdict being
7 rendered “closed” the case (it did not), Intervenor’s motion was filed sufficiently prior to the
8 Court entering such verdict – which invoked the protections articulated in Snyder, supra.
9 *Arguendo*, even if Intervenor had filed *after* the October 7th, 2025 hearing, the Court was still
10 required to hold a hearing, and to required to notice opposing parties as to their rights, lest they
11 be waived, and Intervenor’s petition be granted.
12
13

14 Accordingly, the result the Court reached - “MOOT as the case is closed” – is plainly
15 erroneous, conflicts with well settled precedent, improperly interferes with and extinguishes
16 constitutional rights. “Closure” of the case, by entering a verdict, does not automatically end
17 further pleadings, and does not invite the court the “convenience and discretion” to establish
18 mootness.
19

20 **III. The Trial Court Failed To Follow Procedure And Allow Meaningful Adversial**
21 **Testing, Which Results In Presumed Prejudice and Automatic Reversal**

22 Briefly, because the Court failed to follow the established procedure in Petition of Keene
23 Sentinel, supra at 129, and/or failed to follow the procedure for intervention established by N.H
24 Super. Ct. R. 15 “Intervention” – the Court did not allow for meaningful adversarial testing of
25 Intervenor’s *Motion*. This is a plain error, and a substantial violation of Intervenor’s rights. When
26 “the error’s severity prevent[s] meaningful adversarial testing.... Prejudice may be presumed.”
27
28

1 State v. Anaya, 134 NH 346, 354 (1991). Notice, hearing, and meaningful adversarial testing are
2 all requirements in both Petition of Keene Sentinel, supra, and N.H. Superior Court Rule 15,
3 “Intervention.” (“...the court **shall**...”) In addition, *Arguendo*, the Court cannot conclude the
4 Petition of Keene Sentinel is inapplicable, as the New Hampshire Supreme Court recognized
5 therein that “choice of procedure” does not jeopardize the pursuit of a meritorious claim, and
6 choosing intervention “is a question of form and not substance.” Petition of Keene Sentinel, 136
7 NH 121, 125 (1992). Therefore, for applying the relevant procedural rules, the Court was
8 required to consider Intervenor’s *Motion* both as intervention, and as a petition for access, under
9 the well-settled precedent in Keene Sentinel.

12 Accordingly, waiving and/or failing to comport to these mandates, and preventing further
13 pleadings on the issues, denying a hearing, and denying Intervenor his right to a hearing and his
14 right to be heard, is erroneous and results in presumed prejudice, and an automatically reversible
15 order. Intervenor humbly and respectfully requests that the Court overturn the order, hold a status
16 conference, and instruct the parties on a further pleading and hearing schedule.

18 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

19 **WHEREFORE**, without prejudice and without waiving any rights, Intervenor humbly
20 and respectfully requests that the Honorable Court:

- 21 a. Reconsider and/or overturn the Order;
- 22 b. Schedule a status conference with the parties to determine a further briefing and
23 hearing schedule;
- 24 c. Set a hearing date;
- 25 d. Any such other and further relief as this Honorable Court deems just, necessary,
26 equitable, and proper.
27
28

1 Respectfully submitted,

2 Dated this 20th of October, 2025.

3
4 /s/Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith

5

Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith, *pro se*

6 471 Silver Street, Apt. 105

7 Manchester, NH, 03103

8 brokgrf@gmail.com

9 603.325.0749

10 **CERTIFICATE OF SERVICE**

11 I hereby certify that a copy has been provided
12 to all parties via the Court's eFile service.


13 **/s/Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith**

14 **FACTUAL AVERMENT**

15 I hereby make oath and swear that the facts
16 and allegations contained herein are true and
17 accurate to the best of my knowledge, belief,
18 and ability, without waiving the right to
19 amend same as facts and circumstances so
20 dictate. Further affiant sayeth naught.

21 **/s/Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith**

EXHIBIT 1

request to intervene is
NOT as the case is
closed.

Honorable Martin P. Honigberg
October 8, 2025

Clerk's Notice of Decision
Document Sent to Parties
on 10/10/2025

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE

SUPERIOR COURT, MERRIMACK, SS

Case No.: 217-2024-CR-01167

STATE OF NEW HAMPSHIRE,

vs.

ANNA BARBARA HANTZ MARCONI,

**RENEWED AND SUPPLEMENTAL
MOTION TO INTERVENE**

HEARING REQUESTED

NOW COMES Putative Intervenor Brok-Alan Woodward-Griffith (“Griffith”), **forced pro se**, and hereby moves this Honorable Court to intervene in the instant criminal trial of Defendant Anna Barbara Hantz Marconi. Due to the new facts and circumstances presented, including but not limited to the negotiated plea deal, and pursuant to the arguments herein, and the attached memorandum of law, Intervenor respectfully requests that this Honorable Court **GRANT** this instant motion to intervene. Intervenor states in support as follows.

1. This instant motion to intervene is in preservation and vindicating of Intervenor’s Constitutional Rights to seek evidence – both under the New Hampshire Constitution, Part I, art. 14 and art. 15, and the United States Constitution, 5th, 6th, and 14th amendments.
2. Specifically, Intervenor seeks access to grand jury materials compiled and presented in this instant criminal prosecution, which are believed to contain material evidence related to Intervenor’s civil trial, *Woodward-Griffith v. PC Connection, Inc., et al*, Case No. 216-2025-CV-00187 (Hills. Super. North.).
3. Absent this intervention, Intervenor has no alternate, adequate remedy at law to access these materials.